

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE DISTRICT OF ALASKA

NORTHERN HOSPITALITY GROUP,
INC., an Alaska corporation, d/b/a 49th
State Brewing Company; and DENALI
VISIONS 3000 CORPORATION, an
Alaska corporation, d/b/a 49th State
Brewing Company,

Plaintiffs,

vs.

DON POYNTER,

Defendant.

Case No. 3:22-cv-00012-JMK

**ORDER GRANTING PLAINTIFFS'
MOTION FOR A PROTECTIVE
ORDER**

At Docket 28, Plaintiffs Northern Hospitality Group, Inc., and Denali Visions 3000 Corporation filed an Unopposed Motion for a Protective Order. The Court later learned that Plaintiffs' Motion was opposed by Defendant Don Poynter and directed the parties to meet and confer to reach an agreement regarding a protective order.¹ If an agreement could not be reached, the Court directed Defendant to file objections to Plaintiffs' proposed protective order by November 11, 2022.²

¹ [Docket 32.](#)

² [Id.](#)

Defendant objects to Plaintiffs’ proposed protective order on the grounds that “such confidentiality solely benefits the plaintiff and provides no benefit to defendant who has nothing to hide or keep protected from public record.”³ Plaintiffs then moved for entry of a confidentiality order, arguing that their proposed confidentiality order “benefits *both* parties if either party believes that documents or testimony should be designated ‘confidential’” under the confidentiality order.⁴ The Court agrees with Plaintiffs and finds that their proposed confidentiality order benefits both parties. Further, the Court finds that good cause exists for entry of a confidentiality order where, as here, the litigation likely will entail the exchanging of confidential or proprietary business information.⁵

Plaintiffs are directed to submit a Microsoft Word version of the proposed confidentiality order, filed at Docket 37-1, to this Court’s proposed orders inbox for separate docketing.

IT IS SO ORDERED this 28th day of November, 2022, at Anchorage, Alaska.

/s/ *Joshua M. Kindred*
JOSHUA M. KINDRED
United States District Judge

³ [Docket 36 at 1–2.](#)

⁴ [Docket 37 at 2.](#)

⁵ [See *Baker v. Transunion L.L.C.*, No. CV-06-2927-PCT-NVW, 2008 WL 544826, at *3 \(D. Ariz. Feb. 26, 2008\), *aff’d sub nom. Baker v. Transunion LLC*, 316 F. App’x 594 \(9th Cir. 2009\)](#) (“Parties surrender their private information in the course of litigation only because they trust in the good faith of their adversaries to comply with the court’s order for the protection of their mutual privacy, confidentiality, and business information.”).